

Labor Problems and the Church

THE RIGHT REVEREND JOHN P. CARROLL, D. D.,
BISHOP OF HELENA.

*A Sermon Delivered at the Consecration of Right
Reverend Daniel M. Gorman, D. D., as Bishop
of Boise, in St. Raphael's Cathedral,
Dubuque, Iowa, May 1, 1918.*

“**G**OING therefore, teach ye all nations. . . . Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.”
Matthew XXVIII: 19, 20.

Such is the commission Christ gave to His Apostles and through them to their successors, the Bishops of the Catholic Church. That commission makes teaching the primary function of the episcopal office. It gives to the world for all time a consecrated teaching body, whose infallibility is guaranteed by the abiding presence of the Divine Teacher Himself. In fact, it makes that body not merely the echo of the Saviour of mankind, but His mouthpiece, His very voice. “He that heareth you, heareth Me.”

The Apostles understood the meaning of the commission. “Going forth they preached everywhere, the Lord working withal, and confirming the word with signs that followed.” “Their sound went forth into all the earth and their words unto the end of the world.” To be able to devote themselves more fully to the work of preaching, they went so far as to delegate to others most important functions of their industry. “It is not reason that we should leave the word of God and serve tables. Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of good reputation, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business. But we will give ourselves over to prayer, and to the ministry of the word.” Convert Jews insisted that naturalization into

Judaism by the rite of circumcision be made a condition of citizenship in the Kingdom of Christ. The Apostles held the first Council of the Church, and as authoritative teachers of the New Law, declared that the Christian religion accords equal rights to all nationalities, that it is a world-religion, making no distinction of national or personal conditions, that its appeal is universal, in a word, that it is Catholic. "There is neither Gentile nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian or Scythian, bond nor free. But Christ is all in all."

APOSTLES WERE TEACHERS.

The immediate successors of the Apostles were known chiefly as teachers. Polycarp or Smyrna, Ignatius of Antioch, Clement of Rome, are looked up to as the great teachers of the first century. When the ship of the Church had emerged safely from the narrows of Judaism and reached the high seas of Greek and Roman civilization, it was her Bishops who piloted her through the fierce storms of rationalism that beat upon her from the east and from the west. Their answers regarding the Holy Scriptures, the virtues of Christian life, the attitude of Christian to non-Christian, the relation of the Church to the State were accepted as authoritative and final. It was Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, who routed the Arians of the fourth century and vindicated the Divinity of Jesus Christ. It was Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, who in the fifth century destroyed the power of the Pelagians and laid down the Catholic doctrine of grace and free-will. The Fathers and Doctors of the Church, whose unanimous teaching regarding faith and morals is a certain evidence of Divine Revelation, whose writings form the basis of all ecclesiastical science, upon whose learning Thomas of Aquin and Suarez, Bossuet and Dante built up their famous masterpieces, were nearly all of them Bishops. It was the Bishops of the Church assembled in the great Councils who put down the heresies of the ages. They it was who through their cathedral schools gave effective answer to the paganism of the first centuries. It was they who brought the proud intellect of the Roman world "into captivity unto the obedience of Christ." It was their teaching that con-

verted the Barbarians and made them bearers of Christian faith and Christian civilization to the ends of the old Roman Empire. Theirs were the schools and colleges and universities of the Middle Ages, where the twin lights of faith and science were kept brightly burning, where the Bible and the classics were preserved and transcribed, where law and medicine, agriculture and the manual arts were taught and developed, where the great cathedrals found their inspiration, their architects and builders, where sculpture and painting, poetry and music were nurtured, and whence they spread their sweet influence to draw men's souls to Christ. It was under the tutelage of the Bishops that there grew and prospered those wonderful laboring men's guilds, which united employer and employee in the bonds of Christian fellowship and mutual interest, and thus solved the vexed problems of capital and labor.

And in our modern world the teaching office of the Bishop has lost none of its luster. From the establishment of diocesan seminaries under the inspiration of Charles Borromeo, the Archbishop of Milan, down to the founding of the Catholic University of America by the Bishops of the United States, education has been the chief solicitude of the Hierarchy. In all parts of the world institutions of learning, higher and lower, have grown up and prospered as they never did before under the fostering care of the Bishops. And in our own country the marvelous growth of the Church is due most of all to the system of schools to which the Bishops of America irrevocably committed themselves in the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore. Is it any wonder that Pius X, quoting the words of the Council of Trent, should declare: "*Praecipuum episcoporum munus est praedicare*"; Teaching the truths of Christ's Kingdom on earth is the chief office of Bishops?

NEED OF GUIDANCE.

Never did the world need more than at the present moment the steady influence of the teaching body of the Church. The world war has pushed into prominence problems which have been agitating the minds of thinking men for generations. Chief among these is the

problem of capital and labor. The strong governments of the world have not only conscripted men for their armaments, but they have enlisted the cooperation of labor and capital, and mobilized all the resources of their respective nations. A high sense of patriotism, nowhere more visible than in America, has with unparalleled generosity furnished food, money and service for the common cause. Sabotage, which a little while ago darkened the horizon, has disappeared, the apostles of discontent have been silenced, and the great labor unions have pledged themselves to discountenance strikes for the period of the war in all work needed by their governments.

But the question is being asked on all sides, "What will happen when the war is over?" Millions of fighting men will be returned to civil life. Millions now employed in munition factories, in mines and shipyards will no longer be needed by the Government. What effect will the sudden release of this immense multitude of workers have on the economic life of the world? Owing to the general depletion of wealth, which the protraction of the gigantic struggle will entail, how can adequate employment be furnished? Above all, will the workers who have helped the Government in its hour of need and the soldiers who have risked their lives on the field of battle be willing to accept pre-war conditions? Leaders of both capital and labor and economic writers everywhere say they will not. We have seen the demands of the soldiers and peasants in Russia and the resultant condition of that unhappy country. The Labor-Planning Board of America has "agreed on a basis of principles to govern the relation of capital and labor during the war." And in Great Britain the Labor party has submitted to the Government a "program to be adopted after the war," which involves the creation of "a new social order," a "new industrial civilization."

SOCIALISM.

In the meantime, Socialism continues to preach the doctrine that labor is the source of all wealth, and that, therefore, wages must be increased until labor obtains the possession of all wealth. It foments class-hatred by

attributing to capital all the evils of the present social order—reckless profiteering, wage-slavery, unlimited competition, monstrous social inequalities, intolerable living conditions, physical and moral degradation. It declares these evils to be irremediable under “the capitalistic system” and that, therefore, that system must be overthrown. It even goes so far as to say that the Church is the enemy of labor, that it is in league with capital to defraud labor of its just rewards and to defeat its laudable aspirations.

Can the Church remain silent while such doctrines are being taught to the multitudes? Have her Bishops, the Divinely appointed teaching body, an answer to make to the great question of the hour? Yes, they have an answer, and that answer furnishes the only adequate solution to the vexing problem. Upon the acceptance of that answer depend both the stability of society and the interests of religion. If that answer be not accepted, revolution will cover the earth and to its horrors even the present destructive struggle of the nations is but the mild prelude. That answer is the one the great Bishop of Rome, the immortal Leo XIII, made in his famous Encyclical on the “Condition of the Working Classes.” Leaders of capital and labor, statesmen and churchmen the world over know the answer, for they have made Leo’s Encyclical their cherished text-book ever since its appearance in 1891. But if the evils that threaten society at the close of this war would be effectually averted, the teachings of Leo must be brought home to the workers of the world and to all the employers of labor. A great educational campaign should be waged, not only in our schools, colleges and universities, but in all our societies of men and women, in the pulpit and in the press. The Bishop is the natural leader in that campaign. His enlightened zeal will lend its inspiration and his patient efforts will crown it with success.

What are the great notes to be struck in this campaign? What is the answer to the burning question of the day? Let it be admitted that there are many and great evils in our present industrial system. But this is not the fault either of the Church or of the system itself. It is due to the moral degeneracy consequent upon

a decay of religious belief and to the spirit of greed and pleasure fostered by the great industrial expansion of the last century. In the Middle Ages, when the Church held the world in the bonds of Christian unity, she established guilds for the various crafts, which insured the members justice and social recognition. The religious individualism of the sixteenth century opened the way for social and economic individualism. Then came the French Revolution with its hatred for all authority, civil and religious. The guilds declined and finally disappeared. Defenseless and alone, the workingman was left to the mercy of a new school of economics which saw in him only the physical energy he was capable of exerting. Labor became a mere commodity and was bought on the market at the lowest price. In the coal mines of England, when men seemed to cost too much, women were put in their places, and finally children were substituted for women. No wonder Leo XIII could say in 1891, that "A small number of very rich men had been able to lay upon the teeming masses of the laboring poor a yoke little better than slavery itself."

THE LABORING CLASS.

In the meantime, the Church did not relax her interest in the laboring man. From the very beginning of modern industrialism she has earnestly espoused his cause. The great Von Ketteler, who led the social reform movement in Germany, was called "the workingman's Bishop." The London dock-workers will never forget the friendly interest of Cardinal Manning, and we are all familiar with the efforts of Cardinal Gibbons on behalf of the Knights of Labor. It was their well-known sympathy with the wage-earner and their spirit of fair-play to every interest involved that led to the selection of the late Archbishops Spalding and Quigley as arbitrators in two of the greatest strikes in our history. Organized labor today has no greater friends than the Bishops of the Catholic Church.

It is true that labor unions have sometimes seriously menaced, and even actually destroyed, the prosperity and peace of whole communities; that they have resorted to violence to enforce their demands; that occasionally they have exhibited greater tyranny than that which they

condemned in capitalism. But such occurrences are rare and are not sanctioned by the great body of union men. Organized labor should be judged as a whole. And taken as a whole, its aims and purposes are laudable, its methods are in the main justifiable, and the evils that flow from it are outweighed by its good effects.

To organized labor are due very largely the improved social conditions we behold today. The workingman is lifted up from the degradation into which unrestrained competition had flung him. He is no longer regarded as a beast of burden and his labor a mere article of merchandise. His human dignity has been reclaimed, and the reward of his labor must be sufficient to maintain himself and his family in frugal comfort. Respect for the laborer as a man, as a human being, and reverence for childhood and womanhood, now so emphatically enunciated in the economic legislation of every Christian country in the world, is in no mean degree the triumph of labor unionism and its greatest contribution to the cause of social progress.

The Church, through her Popes and Bishops, endorses the essentials of modern unionism. These are her principles, the principles of the Gospel itself applied to the social conditions of the times. The dignity of the individual, of woman, of the child, the sanctity of the home, doctrines on which the Church has insisted for centuries, are the ideas which are at the basis of the whole labor movement. These are the ideas which have stirred it to action and crowned it with whatever success it has so far achieved. If it adhere to these ideas during the war, and if after the war it earnestly continue their advocacy, labor unionism may become the most effective agency in a world soon to be reconstructed to check the advance of Socialism and to secure the reforms which humanity demands.

THE REMEDY.

The remedy, then, for the social evils which the Church and her Bishops and all right-thinking men deplore just as heartily as do the laboring men themselves does not lie in the destruction of the present social system. The way to clean a house is not to dynamite it. That was the

way of the French Revolution. The sane way is that of the American Revolution, which in principle accepted the old order, purified it of tyranny and selfishness and adjusted it to new conditions. To substitute for the present social system the Socialistic State would do irreparable injury to the workingman himself. It would deprive him of that ownership in land or in the instruments of production and distribution which would be required to increase his resources, better his conditions in life and enable him to provide for the future of himself and his family. It would take from him that sense of independence and self-reliance, that ambition and initiative, that spirit of freedom which alone conduce to dignity and efficiency of human life. It would give over to the State the inalienable rights of the individual and the family, and would introduce a policy of State repression, whose end would be universal "misery and degradation."

Social reform, therefore, and not social destruction, is the remedy offered by the Church and her Bishops. A living wage, reasonable hours, sanitary conditions, work suited to age and sex, proper insurance and compensation laws, cooperative ownership, abolition of reckless profiteering, the use of surplus wealth for the common good, the removal of saloons and brothels, freedom from Sunday work: these are some of the remedies the teaching Church suggests to the united and sympathetic efforts of labor and capital, of legislators and rulers of States. Their cordial adoption will help to solve class hatred and to restore the spirit of justice and brotherly love, which characterized the ancient guilds. Their cordial adoption may avert the impending social revolution and secure the bloodless adjustment of modern society for which all men of good-will hope and pray.

Our Country and the President

MICHAEL J. MAHONY, S. J.

A Speech Delivered on the Occasion of the Banquet of the First Graduating Class of the Fordham University School of Sociology, at the Woolworth Building, New York City, May 24, 1918.

THE President cannot be separated from the country. They cannot be considered apart. They form one organic whole, as the head and the members of the human body are one organized unity. The voice of the President is the voice of the nation. In him are the aspirations and purposes of the vast masses of the people articulate. He catches up the inspiration of his people and gives to it, in his own inimitable manner, definite and adequate expression. His convictions and determined policies may be, indeed, his own, but the international weight and power of these expressed convictions and policies are elevated and sustained and pushed into prominence because they are the echo of a united and determined people.

To judge then of the full significance of the recent remarkable pronouncements of President Wilson, we have to look, not merely to their high idealism which may be expressed from an academic chair; to understand them aright we must bear in mind that these soul-thrilling pronouncements have issued from a seat of power that is supreme in its resources among the world's nations, and that behind the President's words are tens of millions of flashing swords to back them when they are needed. It is this ready force that adds luster to mere idealism by imparting to it the might of reality.

Let us take, then, a few of the recent pronouncements of the President that rise like mountain peaks above all others and have captivated the admiration and enthusiasm of the suffering nations of the earth. Firmly established upon the sun-lit peaks of three great principles announced by the President, a new glow of hope has

been lighted in the hearts of the great and small nations, and has given them new courage to realize in the life of patient peoples those instinctive feelings of justice, liberty and religious aspirations that heretofore were crying for expression, but which no great man and no great nation were single-minded and generous enough to dare voice before a craven and selfish world.

INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE.

The first of these pronouncements asserted that peace among nations can never find a solid resting place for the sole of its foot, unless it is firmly planted upon international justice, justice for the weak, justice for the strong. The representative of another power there is in this world, as superior to the rulers of the nations as the heavens are above the earth, a representative of a spiritual power that saw the birth of all nationalities that exist today, a power that rocked the cradle of their infancy, and with the solicitude of a father guided their destinies to maturity, a power whose undying love for humanity ingratitudo has not diminished, or whose sympathy for the oppressed the wickedness of peoples has not blunted: I mean the indefectible, undying power of the venerable Fisherman of the Tiber. In the unsearchable ways of Providence, the Divine Spirit ever working in the hearts of men and nations seems to have inspired the two greatest Powers of the world today, one temporal and national, the other spiritual and international, to harmonize in their official pronouncements. The Father of the Faithful in Rome, Pope Benedict XV, has also proclaimed to the world that the only foundation upon which permanent peace can hope to rest is the moral law. Eternal justice and the moral law are one. No man has been present at their making. No man can tamper with them; no man can change them. Territory is but the body of a nation, the people that inhabit its hills and valleys are its soul. And the very spirit that moves that soul along the ways of justice is the moral and religious law. It is virtue and morality that have ever nourished the prowess of a nation's sons and daughters and it is the great principles of religion that have ever nourished the morality of a people.

On looking then over the great nations today we observe that not one of them either consciously or unconsciously has uttered so clearly the ringing words of justice that have so completely harmonized with the clarion call of the Father of Christendom to the observance of the moral law, as did the voice of our own United States, expressed by the lips and the pen of our revered President. No flag of the nations has been so closely entwined around the white and golden banner of Catholic Christianity as the bright folds of our own Stars and Stripes. That is a consummation for which we are grateful to God; it is His almighty work. No other explanation can adequately account for this remarkable phenomenon.

THE NATION'S BELIEF IN GOD.

Our President has not left us to grope through the hazy mazes of justice, isolated from the one clear guide to its understanding. In the face of the agnostic, materialistic, pantheistical teachings of the great universities of the land, he dared assert, because he expressed again the convictions and faith of a religious people, that there is a personal God whose Providence rules the nations, to whose supreme sovereignty individuals and peoples are subservient and to whom they owe uncompromising allegiance, whose fatherly love and care for His creatures make audible our prayers. In bidding us, at this crisis of our history, bend our knee in prayer for the success of the cause for which we have unsheathed the sword of justice, our President has truly cut his way amidst the confusion of science and the vagaries of German philosophy, to the simple truth of nature and revelation, because he has seen clearly what the sound heart of America has never abandoned—the truth, that a nation to prosper and win victory must be built on the foundation of moral character and religion, and this character is the only guarantee of its permanence and prosperity. We raise our hands and hearts in thankfulness to Heaven because through the lips of its highest representative a great nation has voiced in the face of an unbelieving world that we are to give God the same place in our hearts that He holds in the universe. God

bless our Country and its President for this pronouncement!

Well does our President know that the bloom of religion and morality is freedom. A religious and moral people cannot be enslaved themselves, nor can they tolerate slavery. Hence has been sounded by this young great nation of the West the trumpet call of freedom to the world. Let a nation but plant true religion and high morality in its breast and inevitably it shall be free at last. In the memorable words of General Foch at the battle of the Marne, that nation may be flanked to the right and flanked to the left, still it will advance to the goal of liberty. Nay, it is already free. An officially enslaved people may still be free and an officially free nation may still be enslaved. When this nation wrote the Declaration of Independence it was in spirit as free as it was on the day of Cornwallis's surrender at Yorktown.

THE DIGNITY OF FREE MEN.

No ruler of any nation, as far as I know, in the march of history has so nobly expressed the dignity and light of freedom for each race and nation as did our President. In New York he said recently: "From men who are not free, expect not comradeship; from men who are not free, expect not sympathy; from men who are not free, expect not helpfulness." This pronouncement of freedom before the world is unique. It sprang forth from the heart of this great nation. It was a pronouncement worthy of the land of liberty and a solace and encouragement to nations yet crushed by the unscrupulous heel of tyranny. Give the nations freedom and you open the gates of international comradeship, international sympathy, international helpfulness. Withhold it and you cut peace off from the only resting place left it on earth.

Religion, morality, liberty: these are the watchwords of our President. We know not what processes of thought led him to these conclusions. But may we not suggest this obvious process of reasoning? Stand on some eminence on a bright, starry night and view the roof of heaven. Astronomy teaches us that millions of these celestial worlds move with order and precision in

their respective orbits. These orbits may cross and re-cross, yet the movements of the planets are so adjusted that they swing in order and safety on their appointed courses, making for us the music of the spheres. No wonder the thoughtful Greeks called the universe a "cosmos," the orderly and beautiful thing. These orderly movements of the spheres are regulated, as science tells us, by a great unifying law, the law of gravitation. Whence this law? A law without a lawgiver is unthinkable. And so back of this law of gravitation and guiding it by His infinite wisdom is God.

Now suppose these heavenly bodies were free. Suppose they revolted against the law of gravitation and, in the folly of their own thought, refused to be guided by the appointed law of their movements and each adopted a law of its own making. In a moment order would cease in the heavens, the appointed orbits would be dislocated and we would witness a crash and destruction of worlds that would involve us in universal ruin.

NATIONS SUBJECT TO A GOD-GIVEN LAW.

Turn now to the nations: What has actually taken place? Nations and peoples are also subject to a great law, a God-given law, the law of moral right and wrong. What gravitation is to the physical worlds around us, the moral law is to the nations of the earth. And just as God's hand is upon the law of gravitation to preserve the planets in their appointed orbits, so is God's hand upon the law of morality and religion to guide men in mutual love, sympathy, helpfulness and peace on earth. Take away the law of gravitation and you have a crash of worlds; take away the recognition of the moral law from the wills and hearts of men and eventually Armageddon rules the nations. Had not this revolt against morality and religion really happened in the great nations before the war?

Nation after nation abandoned the objective teaching of God in morality and religion. The leading Governments, if not the nations of Europe now at war, relying on their own individual thoughts and judgments, repudiated, some in the sixteenth century, some at a comparatively recent date, the outstanding laws of morality

and religion set up by God for the right guidance of human actions, and set out on the perilous hazard of guiding themselves independently of God. These Governments made man and his convenient judgments the center of the moral and religious universe. They made their own morals, their own religions, instead of obeying and being guided by the moral and religious principles made for them by God. Rulers and statesmen and sovereigns made themselves the law, though truth demands that unchangeable, independent law is the sovereign of all rulers and statesmen. What was the obvious outcome but a cataclysm of nations, the destruction of order, peace and justice, a crash of governments like what would happen among planetary worlds should they pursue the course of their respective orbits instead of submitting to the law of gravitation. Hence the Armageddon of modern history.

Peace, order, justice and liberty shall be restored to the nations only when they return and obey the laws that God decreed for the guidance of both nations and individuals, just as the law of gravitation is the guide to the orderly motion of the heavenly bodies, each in its appointed place and sphere. And such a return to law that is not man-made, but God-made, is a return to God, the only sure guarantee of peace and prosperity.

The Superstition of Divorce

GILBERT K. CHESTERTON.

From the London "New Witness."

IHAVE touched before now on a famous or infamous Royalist who suggested that the people should eat grass; an unfortunate remark perhaps for a Royalist to make; since the regimen is only recorded of a royal personage. But there was certainly a simplicity in the solution worthy of a sultan or even a savage chief; and it is this touch of autocratic innocence on which I have mainly insisted touching the social reform known as

divorce. I am primarily more concerned with the arbitrary method than with the anarchic result, very much as the old tyrant would turn any number of women into grass-widows. Anyhow, to vary the legendary symbolism, it never seems to occur to the king in this fairy tale that the gold crown on his own head is a less, and not a more, sacred and settled ornament than the gold ring on the woman's finger.

This change is being achieved by the summary and even secret government which we now suffer; and this would be the first point against it, even if it were really an emancipation; and it is only in form an emancipation. I will not anticipate the details of its defense, which can be offered by others, but I will here conclude for the present by roughly suggesting the practical defenses of divorce, as generally given just at present, under four heads. And I will only ask the reader to note that they all have one thing in common: the fact that each argument is also used for all that social reform which plain men are already calling slavery.

EXCEPTIONS ALTERING RULES.

First, it is very typical of the latest practical proposals that they are concerned with the case of those who are already separated, and the steps they must take to be divorced. There is a spirit penetrating all our society today by which the exception is allowed to alter the rule; the exile to deflect patriotism, the orphan to depose parenthood, and even the widow or, in this case as we have seen the grass-widow, to destroy the position of the wife. There is a sort of symbol of this tendency in that mysterious and unfortunate nomadic nation which has been allowed to alter so many things, from a crusade in Russia to a cottage in South Bucks. We have been told to treat the wandering Jew as a pilgrim, while we still treat the wandering Christian as a vagabond. And yet the latter is at least trying to get home, like Ulysses; whereas the former is, if anything, rather fleeing from home, like Cain. He who is detached, disgruntled, nondescript, indeterminate, is everywhere made the excuse for altering what is common, corporate, traditional and popular. And the alteration is always for the worse. The

mermaid never becomes more womanly, but only more fishy. The centaur never becomes more manly, but only more horsy. The Jew cannot really internationalize Christendom; he can only denominationalize Christendom. The proletarian does not find it easy to become a small proprietor; he is finding it far easier to become a slave. So the unfortunate man, who cannot tolerate the woman he has chosen from all the women of the world, is not encouraged to return to her and tolerate her, but encouraged to choose another woman whom he may in due course refuse to tolerate. And in all these cases the argument is the same: that the man in the intermediate state is unhappy. Probably he is unhappy, since he is abnormal; but the point is that he is permitted to loosen the universal bond which has kept millions of others normal. Because he has himself got into a hole he is allowed to burrow in it like a rabbit and undermine a whole countryside.

THE EXAMPLE OF OTHER COUNTRIES.

Next we have, as we always have touching such crude experiments, an argument from the example of other countries, and especially of new countries. Thus the eugenists tell me solemnly that there have been very successful eugenic experiments in America. And they rigidly retain their solemnity, while refusing with many rebukes to believe in mine, when I tell them that one of the eugenic experiments in America is a chemical experiment, which consists of changing a black man into the allotropic form of white ashes. It is really an exceedingly eugenic experiment, since its chief object is to discourage an inter-racial mixture of blood which is not desired. But I do not like this American experiment, however American; and I trust and believe that it is not typically American at all. It represents, I conceive, only one element in the complexity of the great democracy, and goes along with other evil elements; so that I am not at all surprised that the same strange social sections, which permit a human being to be burned alive, also permit the exalted science of eugenics.

It is the same in the milder matter of liquor laws; and we are told that certain rather crude colonials have es-

tailed prohibition laws which they try to evade, just as we are told they have established divorce laws which they are now trying to repeal. For in this case of divorce, at least, the argument from distant precedents has recoiled crushingly upon itself. There is already an agitation for less divorce in America, even while there is an agitation for more divorce in England.

TO INCREASE THE POPULATION.

Again, when an argument is based on a need of population, it will be well if those supporting it realize where it may carry them. It is exceedingly doubtful whether population is one of the advantages of divorce; but there is no doubt that it is one of the advantages of polygamy. But the very word will teach us to look even beyond Germany for something yet more remote and repulsive. Mere population, along with a sort of polygamous anarchy, will not appear even as a practical ideal to anyone who considers, for instance, how consistently Europe has held the headship of the human race, in the face of the chaotic myriads of Asia. If population were the chief test of progress and efficiency, China would long ago have proved itself the most progressive and efficient State. De Quincey summed up the whole of that enormous situation in a sentence which is perhaps more impressive and even more appalling than all the perspectives of orient architecture and vistas of opium vision in the midst of which it comes: "Man is a weed in those regions."

Many Europeans, fearing for the garden of the world, have fancied that in some future fatality those weeds may spring up and choke it. But no Europeans have really wished that the flowers should become like the weeds. Even if it were true, therefore, that the loosening of the tie necessarily increased the population; even if this were not contradicted, as it is, by the facts of many countries, we should have strong historical grounds for not accepting the deduction. We should still be suspicious of the paradox that we may encourage large families by abolishing the family.

Lastly, I believe it is part of the defense of the new proposal that even its defenders have found its principle

a little too crude. I hear they have added provisions which modify the principle, and which seem to be in substance, first, that a man shall be made responsible for a money payment to the wife he deserts, and second, that the matter shall once again be submitted in some fashion to some magistrate. For my purpose here, it is enough to note that there is something of the unmistakable savor of the sociology we resist, in these two touching acts of faith, in a cheque-book and in a lawyer. Most of the fashionable reformers of marriage are very respectable people, with some honorable exceptions; and nothing could fit more smoothly into the rather greasy groove of their respectability than the suggestion that treason is best treated with the damages, gentlemen, heavy damages, of Mr. Serjeant Buzfuz, or that tragedy is best treated by the spiritual arbitration of Mr. Nupkins.

One word should be added to this hasty sketch of the elements of the case. I have deliberately left out the loftiest aspect and argument, that which sees marriage as a Divine institution; and that for the logical reason that those who believe in this would not believe in divorces, and I am arguing with those who do not believe in divorce. I do not ask them to assume the worth of my creed or any creed; and I could wish they did not so often ask me to assume the worth of their worthless poisonous plutocratic modern society. But if it could be shown, as I think it can, that a long historical view and a patient political experience can at last accumulate solid scientific evidence of the vital need of such a vow, then I can conceive no more tremendous tribute than this, to any faith, which made a flaming affirmation from the darkest beginnings, of what the latest enlightenment can only slowly discover in the end.

Moving Pictures' Malign Influence

From the "Morning Leader."

The cinematograph has, generally speaking, missed its mission. A sustained effort to show us what is taking place the world over, to open before our eyes the panorama of human life, to introduce us to scenes we shall never see, places we shall never visit, ways of life we can only hope to read about but never know by sight; here was a noble mission for the living-picture screen. Then, there is the world of science, which can be drawn upon in endless variety, plant-life, bird-life and animal-life in many phases, the wonders disclosed by astronomy, the marvels unveiled by biology, the life history of a butterfly, the habits of wild animals, the customs of little-known tribes, the methods of savage warfare,—is there any limit to the possibilities of the screen, applied to the service of science and human knowledge? Would not these things instruct, amaze, impress, inform and delight thousands? Then, is the page of history incapable of being illustrated by the cinematograph? Are there not deathless moments in the history of England, of Ceylon, of India, waiting to be depicted on the living-picture screen, to the pleasure and instruction of hundreds? Yet with all this rich field of possibilities, what do we find? In the world of science, the film-taker prefers to show us how prehistoric man lived, loved and fought, his chief hope of success being to develop the possibilities of the suggestively nude. In the domain of history, he is fascinated by Lady Godiva's ride. By way of introducing an Eastern audience to European life, he takes us to the resorts of the demi-monde and the shadiest places in the Latin Quarter. He loves to serve cut-throats and vagabonds, and their women, in appropriate lack of costume, raw to our eyes. His stories of romantic adventure are spiced with melodrama and wild orgies. The modern comedy, coming to us with the most enthusiastic benedictions of the London press, is nauseous. It has but one appeal and that not a nice one. It skates on thin ice and loves to suggest what it dare

not declares. If we express our indignation at such things, we are assured that these things have had a run of two thousand, or it may be ten thousand, nights in London. If we cry out at a living-picture, we are told that it has been shown before the most critical audiences in London or New York.

The old humor has died away, the old wit is a memory, which but a few can recall; the old fun, bubbling and spontaneous, which made one laugh heartily without a trace of restraint, is banished from our midst. Instead, we have the smart and smutty story, the suggestive repartee, the coarse jibe, situations which are daring and dirty, problems which cannot appeal to a pure mind but fasten upon the weak and corruptly inclined. The old sanctions are relaxed, the old morality is scoffed at and made the subject of derisive comedy; the old standards of refined thought and delicate feeling are paraded before us, only to be made fun of. Vice is sanctified and wears an aureole. Women with no reputation become heroines, whose memory Bishops are made to treasure with respect and affection. Incidents which the decent playwright of old merely suggested in order to deplore, and left veiled out of sight, now become climatic of a whole drama and are drawn out to their fullest length, amidst shaded lights and infamously suggestive silence. And the most insolent thing about it all is that such things are served to us with cool confidence that our minds are certain to receive them with pleasure, that our tastes have been sufficiently depraved to enjoy them, and that our natures have been perverted to the point of finding something delectable in their contemplation.